the first Council, almost six years ago. And this House pressed upon the Government to start operations in private fields belonging to private owners, if they are available, in various parts of the country, so that the ryot may by demonstration know if it is possible to adopt these methods to get proper results. It is one thing to spend money upon experiments. The ryots in Cochin will not be able to spend money on experiments nor will they adopt any method when the return is not adequate to the amount that they have to spend upon it. It must be a commercial proposition with them. They must get good return. It is not possible for us to do that, if we spend large amounts of money. Whether the ryot can spend such large amounts is the proper question. We pressed upon the Agricultural Department to go to the rural parts and to establish small farms, say an acre or so, and demonstrate your methods and show to the ryots that by adopting your methods return will be better and they will profit by it. If that cannot be done the existence of the department itself is unnecessary. It has been mentioned by the Hon'ble Member for Chittur that they knew how to cultivate sugar-cane better and that was why Government withdrew.

Now Sir, with reference to the motion it has been stated here that our wishes have been flouted. What does the Diwan say upon it? He says in his statement of 9th August 1929, "It is said that the wholesale cut was in the nature of a protest cut to make the Government open their eyes and see that the chosen representatives of the people are not to be treated with indifference and their wishes are not flouted. I am sorry to note that the attitude of the Government has not been properly understood. No tangible instance can be referred to for showing that the Government was not paying any heed to the opinions of the non-official Members of the Council". Now that same charge is repeated to-day, that the wishes of the House are slighted. But what is our wish? Agriculture and Panchayats must be separated and that these Taluk farms may be established. Is it for our benefit? It is for the benefit of the Members of this Council? Is it a reasonable request to say that the Government can come to the help of the agricultural ryot for whose benefit we are all asking the Government for this separation? That is a statement on both sides of the House. Therefore I support this motion and press upon the Government to separate the Agricultural and Panchayat Departments, as well as to introduce these Taluk farms in as many parts of the country as is possible.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—I just rise to make one or two observations on this subject the merit of which has been thoroughly

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

discussed by the Members who spoke before me. I happened to be one of the Members of that long Committee called the Special Finance Committee which sat for more than two years and which has cost this state 4 to 5 thousand rupees in the shape of travelling allowances, etc., and the result of our observations, unanimously passed, was placed before the Government, giving the reasons why such changes should be introduced and this is one of them. Mark you, the Committee unanimously agreed upon the various things and this was one of the various things. What happened? As self-respecting men, who have been asked to sit upon the Committee we have a right to expect from the Government the reasons why our recommendations should not be accepted. (*Hear, hear*). The Committee practically divided half and half between the Government Members and the non-official Members. Without assigning any reason whatsoever, the whole report has been cut to pieces and the method and the underlying principle, which prompted them to take the course then they took, was to respect the feelings and the whims and fancies of the influential Members of the Government and not listening the reasonable representation of those who unfortunately at the time, did not possess the influence and the power of their colleagues. I have protested in this House on more occasions than one that this sort of position here is not consistent with the dignity of the Government or with our self-respect and this question has been raised to-day and I thought I would avail myself of this opportunity. I request the Head of the administration to go through the report and the reasons we have asigned, why this change should be effected and if he is satisfied, if he is convinced, that our reasoning is just and sound, then irrespective of the consideration of the prestige, that word which has been responsible for graver mischief than any other word, without paying any attention to that word prestige, the Government should confess that they made a mistake in this matter and the Special Finance Committee was right and redress all the wrongs. That is my one request to the Government.

Mr. A. S. Harihara Ayyar.—Sir, I oppose this motion on one point. The remark of the speaker was a very sweeping one that it is a waste of public money so far as the Agricultural Department and the opening of the Ollukara farm are concerned. That is why I put the question on a point of information, how many times has the Hon'ble Member visited the farm? I am sorry no answer did come forth. The Hon'ble Member as well as myself both once belonged to the same profession, that is, the legal profession I was also practising as a Vakil. He even now practises as a Vakil and I finding that planting and Agriculture pay and more remunerative than legal profession, (*Hear,*

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

near and laughter) have firmly taken it up. I find the Hon'ble Member who moved the motion has not the boldness to kick away his profession. I had on several occasions gone to the farm at Ollukara.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—Number of times?

Mr. A. S. Harihara Ayyar.—10 or 15 times. On every occasion I went there I had something to study, something from the stock and the field. I also copy the same in my estate. That is so far as this is concerned. The other is a confusion of two or three issues, that is, the one issue is wastage of public funds so far as agriculture is concerned and the other is we want Taluk demonstration farms. The latter is quite a different issue from the statement that of condemning, "the expenditure for agriculure is a waste of public funds". Every one would agree and I also agree that demonstration farms should be established in all the Taluks so that all people may have the facility to copy the same.

The motion to reduce the allotment of Rs. 400 under II Agriculture and Panchayats—7 Cocoanut Station by Re. 1 was put to votes and was carried.

Dr. A. G. Menon.—The last grant was not put to the votes.

Motion No. 3.

Mr. A. B. Salem.—*To omit the allotment of Rs. 400—under II—Agriculture ana Panchayats—7 Cocoanut Station.*

As the Member did not move the total cut motion it was considered witharawn.

The grant with the reduction of Re. 1 was then put and carried.

(3) XXXIII—Miscellaneous—Special Allowances—Rs. 2,208.

President.—The next motion is by the Secretary to the Diwan, for a grant of Rs. 2,208 under-33-Miscellaneous-Special Allowances.

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—Sir, I rise to move for an additional grant of Rs. 2,208 under—XXXIII—Miscellaneous-Special Allowances. This is for the 2 rupee allowances that were being paid to the subordinate servants under Rs. 10 till the revision came into effect. Though the orders on the revision have been passed, actual postings in the Excise Department have not been done. For, before that is done certain sections of the Salt Regulation and the Abkari Regulation had to be suitably amended and that Bill is proposed to be introduced at this meeting. Till that is done this allowance has to be continued. But when the budget was framed it was anticipated that

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

the Excise revision also would come along with others and no provision was made for this purpose. Therefore, I move that this Rs. 2,208 under-33-Miscellaneous-Special Allowances-be passed by the House.

Mr. A. B Salem.—May I know, Sir, whether there is any correction from Rs. 3,098. A part of the amount represents the House allowance and other Local allowances. It is not proper to debit it to 33-Miscellaneous. The amount is only Rs. 800 and it was thought that it might be possible to meet it from the savings and if not to come forward next time for additional allotments.

President.—Mr. Kumaran Ezhuthassan's cut motion.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—My cut motion was upon the original item No. 3, Excise-Preventive Force.

President.—This is the same item.

Motion No. 1.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,208 under-XXXIII—Miscellaneous—Special Allowances by Re. 1.*

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—The object of this cut motion was to criticise the Excise policy adopted by the Government. This was the subject of discussion in this House on many an occasion. There was a request by this House to appoint a Committee to go into the Excise policy of the State. The Government was pleased to appoint a Committee so long ago as 1100. The Committee made its representation at the earliest opportunity and it remained with the Government for more than three years. The Committee's report was requested to be placed on the Council table on many an occasion and it was never placed. Subsequently about the last Budget Session we had been supplied with a copy of the report as well as the orders of the Government upon the report of the Committee. Therein it is stated that the policy of the Government could not be different from those of the neighbouring districts of Malabar and Travancore, and that they have followed a policy of maximum revenue with minimum consumption. The question is whether the Government has been able by its policy to achieve the end, namely, prohibition. Of course, as far as maximum revenue is concerned, the Government, it must be admitted, has succeeded. But on the other side namely, minimum consumption or even any decrease in consumption, it must be admitted that the Government has signally failed. The following figures will bear out my statement:

Abkari income in 1090, you will find from the budget figures, is Rs. 5,49,955. In 1106 the income from the same is Rs. 13,21,300. Admittedly the Government has

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

succeeded in getting an increase of Rs. 7,71,345 in seventeen years. Certainly it is a successful policy as far as that part of the programme isconcerned. But on the other side, the decrease in consumption, arrack sold in 1089 was 37,238 gallons, in 1104 it is 49,184 gallons, an increase of 11,946 gallons in the course of 16 years. In 1092 the number of trees tapped was 56,105, in 1102 it was 76,749. There is an increase of 20,374 in eleven years. Admittedly an increase in the number of trees and increase in number of gallons sold. This can certainly not mean a diminution in the actual drink of the people. In the orders passed upon the recommendations of the Committee an answer has been attempted. An explanation is offered in these words,—here is a pertinent paragraph in the report—"Taking into consideration the increase in population, the industrial developments in the State, the increased purchasing power of certain communities and the practical difficulties enumerated above, it must be conceded that the Government are slowly and cautiously marching towards the goal of working up towards prohibition etc." A point is here attempted to be made of the increase in population. The census figures of 1096 give us the population of the State, probably 9,97 thousand and odd. We have got the present Census about to be accomplished very soon. We do not know what it will be. Certainly there will be an increase during the course of these ten years. If the Government says that it has been following the policy of maximum revenue and minimum consumption it must refer to ten or fifteen years. During this period the increase in population can certainly be by the birth of little ones and the Excise policy of the State prevents sale of liquor to youngsters. Therefore to say that the increase in population is responsible for the greater number of trees tapped and the larger number of gallons sold cannot hold good. On the other hand, there is the death of the elderly people going on for these last ten years, and in proportion to the figures we will see that as a rule it is the elderly section of the people that have a tendency for this vicious system of drinking. So the statement of the Government that the increase in population during these years is responsible for the greater number of trees and the larger number of gallons of arrack sold is certainly something which cannot be accepted. As far as the policy of the Government is concerned—'maximum revenue'—it has achieved its purpose. 'Minimum consumption' certainly it has failed to achieve. On the other hand instead of a decrease in the drink habit it is on the increase, and the Government is catering to that increase by allowing larger number of trees to be tapped and larger quantity of arrack to be sold. Government must be considered

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

to be admittedly helping to increase the drinking propensity of the people

Then another policy, which the Government says it is following, is the reduction of the number of shops every year. When we look into the figures we will find that those shops which are given up in any particular year are only shops with the minimum income, my statement will not hold in all cases of reduction. Invariably it will be found that the shops reduced are those shops which bring the least income to the Government and with the abolition of such shops Government cannot certainly say that any particular village has become bereft of any toddy shop, the giving up of any shop means the auction sale of the neighbouring shop going higher and bringing a larger amount of revenue. Therefore there is no meaning in saying that the Government by reducing a small number of shops every year is trying to achieve the goal of prohibition.

Another policy of the Government is said to be that the shops are not allowed to be kept near public places, near places of worship, near schools and if we go round the State we will come across places where toddy shops are situated very near temples. As an example to that, there is a toddy shop in the Urakam Constituency, very near to two or three temples, not exactly by the road side, but within a hundred yards of it. There is a toddy shop which is not at a distance of more than forty or fifty yards.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—For festivals.

Mr.P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—Permanently. You can have a sight of it when you pass along the road from Trichur to Cherpu and by the road in the vicinity of two or three temples there is located a toddy shop. There are other instances also. So it is not right to say that the Government follows that policy and thereby tries to achieve their aim of prohibition. What I would say is that the Government is only making a show to the outside world to proclaim that they are doing something. There is no earnestness underlying the policy of the Government and the Government ought to adopt an earnest policy and reduce the sale of liquor in the country. Another argument, brought forward by the Government and it finds a place in the orders passed upon the report, is, that if we follow here a policy different from that followed in the British territory and the neighbouring State of Travancore, there will be an increase in the importation of illicit liquor. That statement means only that the Government are not able to prevent with a strong hand the importation of illicit liquor. We have to appoint the necessary preventive force and see the practice of importing illicit liquor is

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

stopped. To say that the Government is not able to do it, is certainly not the proper thing to say. If adequate funds are necessary for the appointment of preventive force the Government have to find funds. I would, therefore, request the Government to revise its excise policy and show some earnestness in the matter of the reduction of the drink habit of the people.

President.—Mr. Salem, you had a cut motion.

Mr. A. B. Salem.—I rise to second this. I withdraw my cut motion. Before I go into the question of the prohibition policy to be adopted, may I ask Sir, upon the merit of the demand, whether this 2,208 is really necessary. The first question that struck me after the Finance Committee meeting is that you had a large amount of money in the Department itself and how the allowances that we give now would affect the question of the revision and the pay going back to the time when the orders of the Special Finance Committee were passed. These provisions are given with retrospective effect and we have provided in the Budget money to give from the first of Chingam for the whole of this year. We are having these allowances as well. Now, we are going to pay these allowances and the reorganisation will come into force at any moment. For it was delayed only because they had not sufficient time to go through it. When the reorganisation comes, in all these staff under the reorganised scheme, what would be the effect of these allowances? How will that question be met?

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—They will have to be paid in the meanwhile.

Mr. A. B. Salem.—If you have to pay in the meanwhile would this money be reduced from future payments or taken from them, when they get the other reorganised scale coming into force? The reorganised scale when it comes into force, will take retrospective effect from the first of Chingam 1105. So that these allowances are also from 1105 and 1106, till the the reoganisation scheme takes effect in 1106. You will be paying double amounts.

Rama Varmha Thampuran.—They would get only what they are eligible for. Nothing more than they have drawn including the allowance.

Mr. K. Krishna Pisharodi.—These amounts have to be adjusted. When you pay, the amounts drawn will be adjusted as a credit.

Mr A. B. Salem.—That is what I want. These amounts will be, these are technical words, in other words as I would understand it, these amounts will be deducted from the other

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

amounts that are paid. Where is the necessity for this demand if you have got the money there first and if that money is only to be adjusted.

Mr. K. Krishna Pisharodi.—We cannot do that.

Rama Varmha Tampuran.—There should be a head from which it could be drawn. The proper head is 33 Miscellaneous. There is no provision therein for this allowance. These allowances have to be paid till the reorganisation comes into effect. Therefore, there must be some money under that particular head, and for that we move. When the reorganisation is effected, necessary adjustments will be made, and the people will get only what they are really eligible for. No double payment.

Mr. A. B. Salem.—I accept that. I do not accept the implications in it. The amounts will be adjusted and the only question is we have got an amount, you have not got a particular head under which this amount is provided. All that will be necessary is to transfer the amount in that budget and put it under a different head. Why an additional grant? There is no necessity to come to this Council for an additional grant. You have only to make an adjustment from the amounts that have been provided for the preventive force. Rs. 2,208 may be transferred to 33-Miscellaneous. The money is there and only one heading has to be opened. And because there is no heading opened you are unable to pay. You have got Rs. 11,000, under the revised scheme. Provide only Rs. 9,000, take Rs. 2,000 and adjust. There is no necessity for this grant. I would oppose this grant upon that point.

Mr. K. Ayyappan.—Are you for transfer?

Mr. A. B. Salem.—I am not. With the knowledge of the House, it is always allowed. This is not a transfer like what we objected to. This is a transfer which has come to our notice. Now, I am upon the necessity for the money. I submit that there is no necessity for this grant to be made, because the Department has already money in its hands and all that is required is the sanction of the Diwan. With the sanction it can be made very easily so that there is no necessity.

President.—Why should these allotments be reduced by Re. 1?

Mr. A. B. Salem.—Before I come to that, it was a token motion. I want to discuss about the necessity of the grant. There is also my motion to reduce the whole amount. Before that, I want to know whether there is a satisfactory reason for turning my motion into a token motion and speak upon the other subject of prohibition. Therefore, I submit, Sir, I shall resume my seat or speak upon the motion.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

President.—You may speak upon the motion.

Mr. A. B. Salem.—I do not wish to speak upon the motion.

President.—Anybody to second ?

Mr. A. B. Salem.—The motion has been seconded. The motion was made by Mr. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.

President.—The demand of Rs. 2,208 under XXXIII Miscellaneous be reduced by Re. 1.

The motion put and was negatived.

Dr. A. G. Menon.—The division is based upon prohibition.

Mr. P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.—Poll, Sir.

The House divided. Ayes 15 and Noes 17.

Ayes.

1. Mr. K. J. Antony.
2. ,, K. Ayyappan.
3. Dr. A. G. Menon.
4. Mr. A. S. Harihara Ayyar.
5. ,, E. Ikkanda Wariar.
6. ,, K. P. Kannan Nayar.
7. ,, P. Krishna Menon.
8. ,, T. K. Nayar.
9. ,, P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.
10. ,, A. K. Kunhi Moideen.
11. ,, C. J. Mathew.
12. ,, K. Mohamed Seethi.
13. ,, Ouseph P. Kundukulam.
14. ,, M. K. Raman.
15. ,, A. B. Salem.

Noes.

1. Mr. V. K. Aravindaksha Menon.
2. ,, C. Barton Wright.
3. ,, M. A. Chakko.
4. ,, P. C. Chanchan.
5. ,, U. Kandar Menon.
6. ,, V. K. Kochunni Menon.
7. ,, S. S. Koder.
8. ,, T. K. Krishna Menon.
9. ,, T. M. Krishna Menen
10. ,, K. Krishna Pisharodi.
11. ,, T. S. Narayana Ayyar.
12. ,, P. Neelakanda Menon.
13. ,, I. Raman Menon.
14. Rama Varmha Thampuran.
15. Mr. K. Ramunni Menon.
16. Dr. E. A. Veigas.
17. Diwan Bahadur Dr. V. Verghese.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly